

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/450,768	KUBONIWA, OSAMU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Saba Tsegaye	2662	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Saba Tsegaye. (3) F. Cooperrider.
 (2) Jhon Pezzlo. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 27 October 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kaplan et al.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant repesentative discussed the Kaplan et al reference as well as the scope of claim 1. No agreement was reached. App. Rep. will prepared a draft amendment for further to point out the difference between the claim invention and the reference.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required